SPEECH OF MR. LINCOLN,

IN REPLY TO SENATOR DOUGLAS.

At Chicago, July 10, 1858.

From The Chicago Press and Tribune, July 12.

The audience assembled to hear the Hon. Abraham Lincoln on Saturday evening was, in point of numbers, about three-fourths as large as that of the previous evening, when Douglas held forth; and in point of enthusiasm, about four times as great. The crowd extended from the corner of Lake and Dearborn streets the whole length of the Tremont House, and, as on the evening previous, the balconies, windows and roofs of the adjoining buildings were filled with attentive spectators—ladies and gentlemen. The only advertisement of the meeting consisted of a notice in the Saturday morning papers, and a few handbills distributed during the day. The essential difference in the two demonstrations was simply that the Lincoln audience was enthusiastically for Lincoln, and the Douglas audience was but qualifiedly in favor of anybody. This will be admitted by any fair-minded man who witnessed both demonstrations. The Douglas authorities estimate the crowd of Friday evening at 30,000—or something more than the whole male adult population of the city. We presume that 12,000 is a liberal reckoning for that evening, and that 9,000 would about cover the gathering of Saturday night.

During the progress of Mr. Lincoln's speech a procession of 400 men from the Seventh Ward, including the German Republican Club, arrived on the ground, preceded by a band of music and carrying the Seventh Ward Banner. They were received with loud and continued cheers from the audience.

Mr. Lincoln was introduced by C. L. Wilson, esq., and as he made his appearance he was greeted with a perfect storm of applause. For some moments the enthusiasm continued unabated. At last, when by a wave of his hand, partial silence was restored, Mr. Lincoln said:

MY FELLOW CITIZENS: On yesterday evening, upon the occasion of the reception given to Senator Douglas, I was furnished with a seat very convenient for hearing him, and was otherwise very courteously treated by him and by his friends, and for which I thank him and them. During the course of his remarks, my name was mentioned in such a way, as I suppose renders it at least not improper that I should make some sort of reply to him. I shall not attempt to follow him in the precise order in which he addressed the assembled multitude upon that occasion, though I shall perhaps do so in the main.

A QUESTION OF VERACITY—THE ALLIANCE.

There was one question to which he asked the attention of the crowd, which I deem of somewhat less importance—at least of propriety for me to dwell upon—than the others, which he brought in near the close of his speech, and which I think it would not be entirely proper for me to omit attending to altogether, and yet if I were not to give some attention to it now, I should probably forget it altogether. [Applause.] While I am upon the subject, allow me to say that I do not intend to indulge in that inconvenient mode sometimes adopted in public speaking, of reading from documents; but I shall depart from that rule so far as to read a little scrap from his speech, which notices this first topic of which I shall speak—that is provided I can find it in the paper. [Examines *The Press and Tribune* of this morning.]

A VOICE—Get out your specks.

"I have made up my mind to appeal to the people against the combination that has been made against me—the Republican leaders having formed an alliance, an unholy and unnatural alliance, with a portion of the unscrupulous Federal office-holders. I intend to fight that allied army wherever I meet them. I know they deny the alliance; but yet these men who are trying to divide the Democratic party for the purpose of electing a Republican Senator in my place, are just as much the agents and tools of the supporters of Mr. Lincoln. Hence, I shall deal with this allied army just as the Russians dealt with the allies at Sevastopol—that is, the Russians did not stop to inquire, when they fired a broadside, whether it hit an Englishman, a Frenchman or a Turk. Nor will I stop to inquire, nor shall I hesitate, whether my blows shall hit these Republican leaders or their allies who are holding the Federal offices and yet acting in concert with them."

Well, now, gentlemen, is not that very alarming? [Laughter.] Just to think of it! right at the outset of his canvass, I, a poor, kind, amiable, intelligent [laughter] gentleman [laughter and renewed cheers], I am to be slain in this way. Why, my friend, the Judge, is not only, as it turns out, not a dead lion, nor even a living one—he is the rugged Russian Bear! [Roars of laughter and loud applause.]

But if they will have it—for he says that we deny it—that there is any such alliance, as he says there is—and I don't propose hanging very much upon this question of veracity—but if he will have it that there is such an alliance—that the Administration men and we are allied, and we stand in the attitude of English, French and Turks, and he occupies the position of the Russian, in that case, I beg he will indulge us while we barely suggest to him that these allies took Sevastopol. [Long and tremendous applause.]

Gentlemen, only a few more words as to this alliance. For my part, I have to say, that whether there be such an alliance, depends, so far as I know, upon what may be a right definition of the term alliance. If for the Republican party to see the other great party to which they are opposed divided among themselves, and not try to stop the division and rather be glad of it—if that is an alliance, I confess I am in; but if it meant to be said that the Republicans had formed an alliance going beyond that, by which there is contribution of money or sacrifice of principle on the one side or the other, so far as the Republican party is concerned, if there be any such thing, I protest that I neither know of it, nor do I believe it. I will, however, say—as I think this branch of the argument is lugged in—I would, before I leave it, state, for the benefit of those concerned, that one of those same Buchanan men did once tell me of an argument that he made for his opposition to Judge Douglas. He said that a friend of our Senator Douglas had been talking to him, and had among other things said to him: "Why, you don't want to beat Douglas?" "Yes," said he, "I do want to beat him, and I will tell you why. I believe his original Nebraska bill was right in the abstract, but it was wrong in the time that it was brought forward. It was wrong in the application to a territory in regard to which the question had been settled; it was brought forward at a time when nobody asked him; it was tendered to the South when the South had not asked for it, but when they could not well refuse it; and for this same reason he forced that question upon our party: it has sunk our best men all over the nation, everywhere; and now when our President, struggling with the difficulties of this man's getting up, has reached the very hardest point to turn in the case, he deserts him, and I am for putting him where he will trouble us no more." [Applause.]

WHAT IS POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY?

Now, gentlemen, that is not my argument—that is not my argument at all. I have only been stating to you an argument of a Buchanan man. You will judge if there is any force in it. [Applause.] Popular Sovereignty! everlasting Popular Sovereignty! [Laughter and cheers.] Let us for a moment inquire into this vast matter of Popular Sovereignty. What is Popular Sovereignty? We recollect that at an early period in the history of this struggle there was another name for this same thing—Squatter Sovereignty. It was not exactly Popular Sovereignty, but Squatter Sovereignty. What do these terms mean? What do they mean when used now? And vast credit is taken by our friend the Judge in regard to his support of it, when he declares the last years of his life have been, and all the future years of his life shall be, devoted to this matter of Popular Sovereignty. What is it? Why, it is the sovereignty of the people. What was Squatter Sovereignty? I suppose if it had any significance at all, it was the right of the people to govern themselves, to be sovereign over their own affairs, while they were squatted down in a country not their own, while they had squatted on a territory that did not belong to them, in the sense that a State belongs to the people who inhabit it—when it belonged to the nation—such right to govern themselves was called "Squatter Sovereignty."

Now I wish you to mark. What has become of that Squatter Sovereignty? What has become of it? Can you get anybody to tell you now that the people of a Territory have any authority to govern themselves, in regard to this mooted question of Slavery, before they form a State Constitution? No such thing at all, although there is a general running fire, and although there has been a hurrah made in every speech on that side, assuming that that policy had given the people of a Territory the right to govern themselves upon this question; yet the point is dodged. To-day it has been decided—no more than a year ago it was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, and is insisted upon to-day, that the people of a Territory have no right to exclude Slavery from a Territory, that if any one man chooses to take slaves into a Territory all the rest of the people have no right to keep them out. This being so, and this decision being made one of the points that the Judge approved, and one in the approval of which he says he means to keep me down—put me down I should not say, for I have never been up. He says he is in favor of it, and sticks to it, and expects to win his battle on that decision, which says that there is no such thing as Squatter Sovereignty, but that any one man may take slaves into a Territory, and all the other men of the Territory may be opposed to it, and yet by reason of the Constitution they cannot prohibit it. When that is so, how much is left of this vast matter of Squatter Sovereignty, I should like to know?

A VOICE—"It has all gone."

When we get back, we get to the point of the right of the people to make a constitution. Kansas was settled, for example, in 1854. It was a Territory yet, without having formed a constitution, in a very regular way, for three years. All this time, negro slavery could be taken in by any few individuals, and by that decision of the Supreme Court, which the Judge approves, all the rest of the people cannot keep it out; but when they come to make a constitution, they may say they will not have Slavery. But it is there; they are obliged to tolerate it in some way, and all experience shows that it will be so—for they will not take the negro slaves and absolutely deprive the owners of them. All experience shows this to be so. All that space of time that runs from the beginning of the settlement of the Territory until there is a sufficiency of people to make a State constitution—all that portion of time Popular Sovereignty is given up. The seal is absolutely put down upon it by the Court decision, and Judge Douglas puts his on the top of that; yet he is appealing to the people to give him vast credit for his devotion to Popular Sovereignty. [Applause and cries of "Right!" "Right!" "Good!" "Good!"]

Again, when we get to the question of the right of the people to form a State constitution as they please, to form it with Slavery or without Slavery—if that is anything new, I confess I don't know it. Has there ever been a time when any one said that anybody other than the people of the Territory itself should form their constitution? What is new in it, that Judge Douglas should have fought several years of his life, and pledge himself to fight all the remaining years of his life for? Can Judge Douglas find anybody on earth that said that anybody else should form a constitution for a people? [A VOICE—"Yes."] Well, I should like you to name him; I should like to know who he was. [SAME VOICE—"John Calhoun."]

Mr. LINCOLN—No, Sir, I never heard of even John Calhoun saying such a thing. He insisted on the same principle as Judge Douglas; but his mode of applying it in fact was wrong. It is enough for my purpose to ask this crowd, whenever a Republican said anything against it? They never said anything against it, but they have constantly spoken for it; and whosoever will undertake to examine the platform, and the speeches of responsible men of the party, and of irresponsible men, too, if you please, will be unable to find one word from anybody in the Republican ranks, opposed to that Popular Sovereignty which Judge Douglas thinks that he has invented. [Applause.] I suppose that Judge Douglas will claim in a little while that he is the inventor of the idea that the people should govern themselves [cheers and laughter]; that nobody ever thought of such a thing until he brought it forward. We do remember that in that old Declaration of Independence, it is said that "We hold these truths to be "self-evident, that all men are created equal; that "they are endowed by their Creator with certain in-"alienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, "and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these "rights governments are instituted among men, de-"riving their just powers from the consent of the gov-"erned." There is the origin of Popular Sovereignty. [Loud applause.] Who, then, shall come in at this day and claim that he invented it. [Laughter and applause.]

LECOMPTON CONSTITUTION.

The Lecompton Constitution connects itself with this question, for it is in this matter of the Lecompton Constitution that our friend Judge Douglas claims such vast credit. I agree that in opposing the Lecompton Constitution, so far as I can perceive, he was right. ["Good, good."] I do not deny that at all; and, gentlemen, you will readily see why I could not deny it, even if I wanted to. But I do not wish to; for all the Republicans in the nation opposed it, and they would have opposed it just as much without Judge Douglas's aid as with it. They had all taken ground against it long before he did. Why, the reason that he urges against that Constitution I urged against him a year before. I have the printed speech in my hand. The argument that he makes why that Constitution should not be adopted, that the people were not fairly represented nor allowed to vote, I pointed out in a speech a year ago, which I hold in my hand now, that no fair chance was to be given the people. ["Read it," "Read it."] I shall not waste your time by trying to read it. ["Read it," "Read it."] Gentlemen, reading from speeches is a very tedious business, particularly for an old man that has to put on spectacles, and the more so if the man be so tall that he has to bend over to the light. [Laughter.]

A little more, now, as to this matter of popular sovereignty and the Lecompton Constitution. The Lecompton Constitution, as the Judge tells us, was defeated. The defeat of it was a good thing or it was not. He thinks the defeat of it was a good thing, and so do I, and we agree in that. Who defeated it?

A VOICE—Judge Douglas.

Mr. LINCOLN—Yes, he furnished himself, and if you suppose he controlled the other Democrats that went with him, he furnished three votes, while the Republicans furnished twenty. [Applause.]

This is what he did to defeat it. In the House of Representatives he and his friends furnished some twenty votes and the Republicans furnished ninety odd. [Loud applause.] Now who was it that did the work?

A VOICE—Douglas.

Mr. LINCOLN—Why, yes, Douglas did it! To be sure he did.

Let us, however, put that proposition another way. The Republicans could not have done it without Judge Douglas. Could he have done it without them? [Applause.] Which could have come the nearest to doing it without the other? [Renewed applause. "That's it," "that's it;" "good," "good."]

A VOICE—Who killed the bill?

ANOTHER VOICE—Douglas.

Mr. LINCOLN—Ground was taken against it by the Republicans long before Douglas did it. The proportion of opposition to that measure is about five to one.

A VOICE—Why didn't they come out on it?

Mr. LINCOLN—You don't know what you are talking about, my friend. I am quite willing to answer any gentleman in the crowd who asks me an intelligent question. [Great applause.]

Now, who in all this country has ever found any of our friends of Judge Douglas's way of thinking, and who have acted upon this main question, that has ever thought of uttering a word in behalf of Judge Trumbull? [A voice, "We have."] I defy you to show a printed resolution passed in a Democratic meeting—I take it upon myself to defy any man to show a printed resolution of a Democratic meeting, large or small, in favor of Judge Trumbull, or any of the five to one Republicans who beat that bill. Everything must be for the Democrats! They did everything, and the five to one that really did the thing, they snub over, and they do not seem to remember that they have an existence upon the face of the earth. [Applause.]

LINCOLN AND DOUGLAS.

Gentlemen: I fear that I shall become tedious. [Go on, go on.] I leave this branch of the subject to take hold of another. I take up that part of Judge Douglas's speech in which he respectfully attended to me. [Laughter.]

Judge Douglas makes two points upon my recent speech at Springfield. He says they are to be the issues of this campaign. The first one of these points he based upon the language in a speech which I delivered at Springfield, which I believe I can quote correctly from memory. I said there that "we are "now far into the 5th year since a policy was instituted "for the avowed object and with the confident promise "of putting an end to Slavery agitation; under the "operation of that policy, that agitation had only not "ceased, but has constantly augmented"—[A voice—"That's the very language."] "I believe it will not "cease until a crisis shall have been reached and "passed. A house divided against itself cannot "stand. I believe this Government cannot endure "permanently half slave and half free." [Applause.] "I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—" I am quoting from my speech—"I do not expect the house "to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided. "It will become all one thing or all the other. Either "the opponents of Slavery will arrest the spread of "it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in "the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinc-"tion, or its advocates will push it forward until it "shall become alike lawful in all the States North as "well as South." [Good, good.]

What is the paragraph. In this paragraph which I have quoted in your hearing, and to which I ask the attention of all, Judge Douglas thinks he discovers great political heresy. I want your attention particularly to what he has inferred from it. He says I am in favor of making all the States of this Union uniform in all their internal regulations; that in all their domestic concerns I am in favor of making them entirely uniform. He draws this inference from the language I have quoted to you. He says that I am in favor of making war by the North upon the South, for the extinction of Slavery; that I am also in favor of inviting, as he expresses it, the South to a war upon the North, for the purpose of nationalizing Slavery. Now, it is singular enough, if you will carefully read that passage over, that I did not say that I was in favor of anything in it. I only said what I expected would take place. I made a prediction only; it may have been a foolish one perhaps. I did not even say that I desired that Slavery should be put in course of ultimate extinction. I do say so now, however [great applause], so there need be no longer any difficulty about that. It may be written down in the next speech. [Applause and laughter.]

Gentlemen, Judge Douglas informed you that this speech of mine was probably carefully prepared. I admit that it was. I am not master of language; I have not a fine education; I am not capable of entering into a disquisition upon dialectics, as I believe you call it; but I do not believe the language I employed bears any such construction as Judge Douglas put upon it. But I don't care about a quibble in regard to words. I know what I meant, and I will not leave this crowd in doubt, if I can explain it to them, what I really meant in the use of that paragraph.

I am not, in the first place, unaware that this Government has endured eighty-two years, half Slave and half Free. I know that. I am tolerably well acquainted with the history of the country, and I know that it has endured eighty-two years, half Slave and half Free. I believe—and that is what I meant to allude to there—I believe it has endured, because, during all that time, until the introduction of the Nebraska Bill, the public mind did rest, all the time, in the belief that Slavery was in course of ultimate extinction. ["Good!" "Good!" and applause.] That was what gave us the rest that we had through that period of eighty-two years—at least, so I believe. I have always hated Slavery, I think as much as any Abolitionist. [Applause.] I have been an Old Line Whig. I have always hated it, but I have always been quiet about it until this new era of the introduction of the Nebraska Bill began. I always believed that everybody was against it, and that it was in course of ultimate extinction. [Pointing to Mr. Browning, who stood near by]—Browning thought so; the great mass of the nation have rested in the belief that Slavery was in course of ultimate extinction. They had reason so to believe.

The adoption of the Constitution and its attendant history led the people to believe so, and that such was the belief of the framers of the Constitution itself. Why did those old men, about the time of the adoption of the Constitution, decree that Slavery should not go into the new territory where it had not already gone? Why declare that within twenty years the African slave trade, by which slaves are supplied, might be cut off by Congress? Why were all these acts? I might enumerate more of such acts—but enough. What were they but a clear indication that the framers of the Constitution intended and expected the ultimate extinction of that institution? [Cheers.] And now when I say, as I say in this speech, that Judge Douglas has quoted from, when I say that I think the opponents of Slavery will resist the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest with the belief that it is in course of ultimate extinction, I only mean to say that they will place it where the founders of this Government originally placed it.

I have said a hundred times, and I have now no inclination to take it back, that I believe there is no right, and ought to be no inclination, in the people of the Free States to enter into the Slave States, and interfere with the question of Slavery at all. I have said that always. Judge Douglas has heard me say it—if not quite a hundred times, at least as good as a hundred times; and when it is said that I am in favor of interfering with Slavery where it exists, I know it is unwarranted by anything I have ever intended, and, as I believe, by anything I have ever said. If, by any means, I have ever used language which could fairly be so construed (as, however, I believe I never have), I now correct it.

[Here the shouts of the Seventh Ward Delegation announced that they were coming in procession. They were received with enthusiastic cheers.]

So much, then, for the inference that Judge Douglas draws, that I am in favor of setting the sections at war with one another. I know that I never meant any such thing, and I believe that no fair mind can infer any such thing from anything I have ever said. ["Good, good."]

Now in relation to his inference that I am in favor of a general consolidation of all the local institutions of the various States. I will attend to that for a little while, and try to inquire if I can how on earth it could be that any man could draw such an inference from anything I said. I have said, very many times, in Judge Douglas's hearing, that no man believed more than I in the principle of self-government; that it lies at the bottom of all my ideas of just government from beginning to end. I have denied that his use of that term applies properly. But for the thing itself I deny that any man has ever gone ahead of me in his devotion to the principle, whatever he may have done in efficiency in advocating it. I think that I have said it in your hearing—that I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruit of his labor, so far as it in no wise interferes with any other man's rights [applause], that each community, as a State, has a right to do exactly as it pleases with all the concerns within that State that interfere with the rights of no other State, and that the General Government, upon principle, has no right to interfere with anything other than that general class of things that does concern the whole. I have said that at all times. I have said, as illustrations, that I do not believe in the right of Illinois to interfere with the cranberry laws of Indiana, the oyster laws of Virginia, or the Liquor Laws of Maine. I have said these things over and over again and I repeat them here as my sentiments.

How is it, then that Judge Douglas infers, because I hope to see Slavery put where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, that I am in favor of Illinois going over and interfering with the cranberry laws of Indiana? What can authorize him to draw any such inference? I suppose there might be one thing that at least enabled *him* to draw such an inference that would not be true with me or with many others—that is, because he looks upon all this matter of Slavery as an exceedingly little thing—this matter of keeping one-sixth of the population of the whole nation in a state of oppression and tyranny unequaled in the world. He looks upon it as being an exceedingly little thing—only equal to the question of the cranberry laws of Indiana—as something having no moral question in it—as something on a par with the question of whether a man shall pasture his land with cattle, or plant it with tobacco—so little and so small a thing that he concludes that if I could desire that anything should be done to bring about the ultimate extinction of that little thing, I must be in favor of bringing about an amalgamation of all the other little things in the Union. Now, it so happens—and there, I presume, is the foundation of this mistake—that the Judge thinks thus; and it so happens that there is a vast proportion of the American people that do *not* look upon that matter as being this very little thing. They look upon it as a vast moral evil; they can prove it is such by the writings of those who gave us the blessings of liberty which we enjoy, and that they so looked upon it, and not as an evil merely confining itself to the States where it is situated; and while we agree that, by the Constitution we assented to, in the States where it exists, we have no right to interfere with it because it is in the Constitution, and we are by both duty and inclination to stick by the Constitution in all its letter and spirit from beginning to end. [Great applause.]

So much, then, as to my disposition—my wish—to have all the State Legislatures blotted out, and to have one general consolidated government and a uniformity of domestic regulations in all the States; by which I suppose it is meant, if we raise corn here, we must make sugar-cane grow here too, and we must make those things which grow North grow in the South. All this I suppose the Judge understands I am in favor of doing. Now, so much for all this nonsense—for I must call it so. The Judge can have no issue with me on a question of establishing uniformity in the domestic regulations of the States.

DRED SCOTT DECISION.

A little now on the other point—the Dred Scott decision. Another one of the issues he says that is to be made with me is upon his devotion to the Dred Scott decision, and my opposition to it.

I have expressed heretofore, and I now repeat, my opposition to the Dred Scott decision, but I should be allowed to state the nature of that opposition, and I ask your indulgence while I do so. What is fairly implied by the term Judge Douglas has used, "resist-"ance to the decision?" I do not resist it. If I wanted to take Dred Scott from his master I would be interfering with property, and that terrible difficulty that Judge Douglas speaks of, of interfering with property, would arise. But I am doing no such thing as that, but all that I am doing is refusing to obey it as a political rule. If I were in Congress, and a vote should come up on a question whether Slavery should be prohibited in a new Territory, in spite of that Dred Scott decision, I would vote that it should. [Applause, "Good for you," "We hope to see it," "That's right"].

Mr. LINCOLN—That is what I would do. ["You will have a chance soon"]. Judge Douglas said last night, that before the decision he might advance his opinion, and it might be contrary to the decision when it was made; but *after* it was made he would abide by it until it was reversed. Just so! We let this property abide by the decision, but we will try to reverse that decision. [Loud applause—cries of "good"]. We will try to put it where Judge Douglas would not object, for he says he will obey it until it is reversed. Somebody has to reverse that decision, since it is made, and we mean to reverse it, and we mean to do it peaceably.

What are the uses of decisions of courts? They have two uses. As rules of property they have two uses. First; they decide upon the question before the court. They decide in this case that Dred Scott is a slave. Nobody resists that. Not only that, but they say to everybody else, that persons standing just as Dred Scott stands, is as he is. That is, they say that when a question comes up upon another person it will be so decided again, unless the Court decides another way [cheers—cries of "Good"], unless the Court overrules its decision. [Renewed applause.] Well, we mean to do what we can to have the Court decide the other way. That is one thing we mean to try to do.

The sacredness that Judge Douglas throws around this decision, is a degree of sacredness that has never before been thrown around any other decision. I have never heard of such a thing. Why, decisions apparently contrary to that decision, or that good lawyers thought were contrary to that decision, have been made by that very Court before. It is the first of its kind; it is an astonisher in legal history. [Laughter.] It is a new wonder of the world. [Laughter and applause.] It is based upon falsehood in the main as to the facts—allegations of facts upon which it stands are not facts at all in many instances, and no decision made on any question—the first instance of a decision made under so many unfavorable circumstances—thus placed has ever been held by the profession as law, and it has always needed confirmation before the lawyers regarded it as a settled law. But Judge Douglas will have it that all hands must take this extraordinary decision, made under these extraordinary circumstances, and give their votes in Congress in accordance with it, yield to it in every possible sense. Circumstances alter cases. Do not gentlemen here remember the case of that same Supreme Court, some twenty-five or thirty years ago, deciding that a National Bank was constitutional? I ask, if somebody does not remember that a National Bank was declared to be constitutional? ["Yes," "yes."] Such is the truth, whether it be remembered or not. The bank charter ran out, and a re-charter was granted by Congress. That re-charter was laid before Gen. Jackson. It was urged upon him when he denied the constitutionality of the bank, that the Supreme Court had decided that it was constitutional; and Gen. Jackson then said that the Supreme Court had no right to lay down a rule to govern a coordinate branch of the Government, the members of which had sworn to support the Constitution—that each member had sworn to support that Constitution as he understood it. I will venture here to say, that I have heard Judge Douglas say that he approved of Gen. Jackson for that act. What has now become of all his tirade about "resistance to the Supreme Court?" [Gone up," "Gone to the theater."]

My fellow-citizens, getting back a little, for I pass from these points, when Judge Douglas makes his threat of annihilation upon the "alliance." He is cautious to say that that warfare of his is to fall upon the leaders of the Republican party. Almost every word he utters and every distinction he makes, has its significance. He means for the Republicans that do not count themselves as leaders, to be his friends; he makes no fuss over them; it is the leaders that he is making war upon. He wants it understood that the mass of the Republican party are really his friends. It is only the leaders that are doing something, that are intolerant and that require extermination at his hands. As this is clearly and unquestionably the light in which he presents that matter, I want to ask your attention, addressing myself to the Republicans here, that I may ask you some questions, as to where you, as the Republican party, would be placed if you sustained Judge Douglas in his present position by a reelection? I do not claim, gentlemen, to be unselfish. I do not pretend that I would not like to go to the United States Senate [laughter], I make no such hypocritical pretense, but I do say to you that in this mighty issue, it is nothing to you—nothing to the mass of the people of the nation whether or not Judge Douglas or myself shall ever be heard of after this night, it may be a trifle to either of us, but in connection with this mighty question, upon which hang the destinies of the nation, perhaps, it is absolutely nothing; but where will you be placed if you reindorse Judge Douglas? Don't you know how apt he is—how exceedingly anxious he is at all times to seize upon anything and everything to persuade you that something *he* has done *you* did yourselves? Why, he tried to persuade you last night that our Illinois Legislature instructed him to introduce the Nebraska bill. There was nobody in that Legislature ever thought of such a thing; and when he first introduced the bill, he never thought of it; but still he fights furiously for the proposition, and that he did it because there was a standing instruction to our Senators to be always introducing Nebraska bills. [Laughter and applause.] He tells you he is for the Cincinnati platform, he tells you he is for the Dred Scott decision. He tells you, not in his speech last night, but substantially in a former speech, that he cares not if Slavery is voted up or down—he tells you the struggle on Lecompton is passed—it may come up again or not, and if it does he stands where he stood when, in spite of him and his opposition, you built up the Republican party. If you indorse him, you tell him you do not care whether Slavery be voted up or down, and he will close, or try to close, your mouths with his declaration repeated by the day, the week, the month and the year. Is that what you mean? [Cries of "No." One voice, "Yes."] Yes, I have no doubt you who have always been for him if you mean that. No doubt of that. [A voice: "Hit him again."] Soberly I have said, and I repeat it, I think in the position in which Judge Douglas stood in opposing the Lecompton Constitution he was right. He does not know that it will return, but if it does we may know where to find him; and if it does not, we may know where to look for him, and that is on the Cincinnati platform. Now, I could ask the Republican party, after all the hard names that Judge Douglas has called them by—all his repeated charges of their inclination to marry with and buy negroes, all his declarations of Black Republicanism—by the way, we are improving, the black has got rubbed off; but with all that if he be indorsed by Republican votes where do you stand? Plainly you stand ready saddled, bridled and harnessed, and waiting to be driven over into the Slavery extension camp of the nation, [a voice: "We will hang ourselves first"]—just ready to be driven over, tied together in a lot—to be driven over, every man with a rope around his neck, that halter being held by Judge Douglas. That is the question. If Republican men have been in earnest about what they have done, I think they had better not do it, but I think that the Republican party is made up of those who, as far as they can peaceably, will oppose the extension of Slavery, and who will hope for its ultimate extinction—who will believe, if it ceases to spread, that it is in course of ultimate extinction. If they believe it is wrong in grasping up the new lands of the continent and keeping them from the settlement of free white laborers, who want the land to bring up their families upon; if they are in earnest, although they may make a mistake, they will grow restless, and the time will come when they will come back again and reorganize—if not by the same name, at least upon the same principles as their party now has. It is better, then, to save the work while it is begun. You have done the labor; maintain it—keep it. If men choose to serve you, go with them; but as you have made up your organization upon principle, stand by it; for, as surely a God reigns over you and has inspired your mind, and given you a sense of propriety, and continues to give you hope, so surely you will still cling to these ideas, and you will at last come back again after your wanderings, merely to do your work over again. [Loud applause.]

We were often—more than once, at least—in the course of Judge Douglas's speech last night, reminded that this Government was made for white men—that he believed it was made for white men! Well, that is putting it in a shape in which no one wants to deny it, but the Judge then goes into his passion for drawing inferences that are not warranted. I protest, now and forever, against that counterfeit logic which presumes that because I do not want a negro woman for a slave, I do necessarily want her for a wife. [Laughter and cheers.] My understanding is that I need not have her for either, but as God made us separate, we can leave one another alone and do one another much good thereby. There are white men enough to marry all the white women, and enough black men to marry all the black women, and in God's name let them be so married. The Judge regales us with the terrible enormities that take place by the mixture of races; that the inferior race bears the superior down. Why, Judge, if we will not let them get together in the Territories they won't mix there. [Immense applause.]

A VOICE—"Three cheers for Lincoln." [The cheers were given with a hearty good will.]

Mr. LINCOLN—I should say at least that this is a self-evident truth.

Now, it happens that we meet together once every year, some time about the Fourth of July, for some reason or other. These Fourth-of-July gatherings, I suppose, have their uses. If you will indulge me, I will state what I suppose to be some of them.

We are now a mighty nation; we are thirty, or about thirty millions of people, and we own and inhabit about one-fifteenth part of the dry land of the whole earth. We run our memory back over the pages of history for about eighty-two years, and we discover that we were then a very small people in point of numbers—vastly inferior to what we are now—with a vastly less extent of country, with vastly less of everything we deem desirable among men—we look upon the change as exceedingly advantageous to us and to our posterity, and we fix upon something that happened away back, as in some way or other being connected with this rise of prosperity. We find a race of men living in that day whom we claim as our fathers and grandfathers; they were iron men; they fought for the principle that they were contending for; and we understand that by what they then did it has followed that the degree of prosperity that we now enjoy has come to us. We hold this annual celebration to remind ourselves of all the good done in this process of time, of how it was done and who did it, and how we are historically connected with it; and we go from these meetings in better humor with ourselves—we feel the more attached the one to the other, and more firmly bound to the country we inhabit. In every way we are better men in the age, and race, and country in which we live for these celebrations. But after we have done all this we have not yet reached the whole. There is something else connected with it. We have beside these men—descended by blood from our ancestors—among us perhaps half of our people who are not descendants at all of these men, they are men who have come from Europe—German, Irish, French and Scandinavian—men that have come from Europe themselves or whose ancestors have come hither and settled here, finding themselves our equals in all things. If they look back through this history to trace their connection with those days by blood, they find they have none, they cannot carry themselves back into that glorious epoch and make themselves feel that they are part of us, but when they look through that old Declaration of Independence they find that those old men say that "We hold these "truths to be self-evident, that all men are created "equal," and then they feel that that moral sentiment taught in that day evidences their relation to those men, that it is the father of all moral principle in them, and that they have a right to claim it as though they were blood of the blood, and flesh of the flesh of the men who wrote that Declaration (loud and long continued applause), and so they are. That is the electric cord in that Declaration that links the hearts of patriotic and liberty-loving men together, that will link those patriotic hearts as long as the love of freedom exists in the minds of men throughout the world [Applause.]

Now, Sirs, for the purpose of squaring things with this idea of "don't care if Slavery is voted up or voted down," for sustaining the Dred Scott decision—[A voice: "Hit him again"]—for holding that the Declaration of Independence did not mean anything at all, we have Judge Douglas giving his exposition of what the Declaration of Independence means, and we have him saying that the people of America were equal to the people of England. According to his construction, you Germans are not connected with it. Now, I ask you in all soberness, if all these things—if indulged in, if ratified, if confirmed and indorsed, if taught to our children and repeated to them—do not tend to rub out the sentiment of liberty in the country, and to transform this government into a government some other form. These arguments that are made, that the inferior race are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying; that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow—what are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of kingcraft were of this class; they always bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden. That is their argument, and this argument of the Judge is the same old serpent that says, you work and I eat, you toil and I will enjoy the fruits of it. Turn it whatever way you will—whether it come from the mouth of a king, an excuse for enslaving the people of his country, or from the mouth of men of one race as a reason for enslaving the men of another race, it is all the same old serpent; and I hold if that course of argumentation, that is made for the purpose of convincing the public mind that we should not care about this, should be granted, it does not stop with the negro. I should like to know if taking this old Declaration of Independence, which declares that all men are equal upon principle, and making exceptions to it, where will it stop? If one man says it does not mean a negro, why may not another say it does not mean some other man? If that declaration is not the truth, let us get the statute book in which we find it, and tear it out! Who is so bold as to do it? [Voices—"Me!" "No one!" &c.] If it is not true, let us tear it out! [Cries of "No! no!"] Let us stick to it, then! [Cheers.] Let us stand firmly by it, then! [Applause.]

It may be argued that there are certain conditions that make necessities and impose them upon us, and to the extent that a necessity is imposed upon a man he must submit to it. I think that was the condition in which we found ourselves when we established this Government. We had Slavery among us, we could not get our Constitution unless we permitted them to remain in Slavery; we could not secure the good we did secure if we grasped for more, and having by necessity submitted to that much, it does not destroy the principle that is the charter of our liberties. Let that charter stand as our standard.

My friend has said to me that I am a poor hand to quote Scripture. I will try it again, however. It is said in one of the admonitions of the Lord, "As your "Father in Heaven is perfect, be ye also perfect." The Savior, I suppose, did not expect that any human creature could be perfect as the Father in Heaven; but He said, "As your Father in Heaven "is perfect, be ye also perfect." He set that up as a standard, and he who did most toward reaching that standard attained the highest degree of moral perfection. So I say in relation to the principle that all men are created equal, let it be as nearly reached as we can. If we cannot give freedom to every creature, let us do nothing that will impose Slavery upon any other creature. [Applause.] Let us then turn this Government back into the channel in which the framers of the Constitution originally placed it. Let us stand firmly by each other. If we do not do so we are turning in the contrary direction, that our friend Judge Douglas proposes—not intentionally—as working in the traces that tend to make this one universal Slave nation. [A voice—"That is so."] He is one that runs in that direction, and as such I resist him.

My friends, I have detained you about as long as I desired to do, and I have only to say, let us discard all this quibbling about this man and the other man—this race and that race and the other race being inferior, and therefore they must be placed in an inferior position—discarding our standard that we have left us. Let us discard all these things, and unite as one people throughout this land, until we shall once more stand up declaring that all men are created equal.

My friends, I could not, without launching off upon some new topic, which would detain you too long, continue to-night. [Cries of "Go on."] I thank you for this most extensive audience that you have furnished me to-night. I leave you, hoping that the lamp of liberty will burn in your bosoms until there shall no longer be a doubt that all men are created free and equal.

Mr. Lincoln retired amid a perfect torrent of applause and cheers.

A SOUTHERNER ON STEAM ENGINES AND NIGGERS.—Messrs. Phillips, Sampson & Co., says *The Boston Journal*, have received the following letter from one of the subscribers to *The Atlantic Monthly*, in Louisiana. The monkey experiment is decidedly rich:

"———, June 24, 1858.

"Messrs. PHILIPS, THOMSON & CO.—*Gentlemen:* In an article heded 'What we are going to make,' in the last No. of your Magazine, the writer thinks that the Millenium for niggers is to be brought about by steam, on the ground that a bushil of coal fed to a steam engin will produce more power than a bushil of Injin corn fed to a nigger, and that the great improvement that is to take place in these engins in 50 or 100 years will enable us to navigate our corn fields, and plow as much cotton, with one critter of this sort, in the same length of time, and at a less expense, than with 10 niggers; consequently, we will free the niggers as a nusence, and take the engin instead. Now jest grant that what he says about plowin by steem should turn out true—and cotten could be grow'd in this way—I jest want to ask him one question—When it comes to *pickin out*, what is his steem engin then? It takes *fingers* to du this sort of work, and no steem engin will ever be maid to strike a lick like them. If we ever du plow by steem, which I won't deny mought be done, we'll turn our niggers into piekers—make more cotton and sell at a less price. He is whot might be called a speculative genius, like a feller who lives not far from here; he thought he'd make an improvement in *picking*, and then monkeys would be the very article. One monkey would pick as much as a nigger, and one nigger could oversee 19 monkes. The monkeys was got and the trial maid; the only mistake about it was, instead of one nigger managing 10 monkeys, it took 10 niggers to manage one monkey; so he has giv up expeerimentin and sticks to the old way of getherin his crop. Some one says that every man is crazy on some subject. Your man is crazy on steem, but its not exactly the *right* sort to *elevate the ideas*. Tell him to fire up and try agin. You will excuse for saying that I think some of your articles is rather too hifalutin on abolishen subjects. Respectfully,

A SUBSCRIBER.

P. S.—Tell your breakfast-table man to *go ahead*—he's one of em.

BUT ME NO BUTTS—PRESIDENT BUCHANAN'S LAST PUN.—*The Buffalo Republic* tells the following at the expense of Mr. Butts of *The Rochester Advertiser*, who deserved better things, both from *The Republic* and the President:

BUT.—This little conjunction is a terrible intermeddler with results. During the late visitation of would-be postmasters from this State at Washington, a little scene occurred at the White House that confirms the effect of this fearful little spoil-sport. The candidates for the different offices did not rely upon themselves alone for success, but brought with them influential men from their respective cities, as aids to lead the forlorn hopes and sap the fortress of Executive patronage. Among them came several gentlemen from Rochester, who were advocating the claims of a Democratic editor to the Post-Office in that city. Our editor appeared to be sanguine of the appointment, but to clinch the matter, he sent a well-known politician to call on Mr. Buchanan, and conclude the matter beyond a peradventure. Politician called, and was received very politely; broached the subject, and talked very eloquently in favor of the editor. Mr. Buchanan heard him through quietly, and when he had finished, said the appointment had already been decided upon. And was it his friend? inquired the politician. Mr. Buchanan solemnly shook his head. The astonished politician immediately began recapitulating the editor's services, when Mr. Buchanan politely begged to be excused at present, as several gentlemen were waiting to see him on important business. "Should be happy to see you again," said the President, "or any of my friends from Rochester." "But—but," expostulated the chagrinned politician. "Oh, I *beg* of you, but me no BUTTS, Sir," said the President with a smile—"good morning." With how much Paine these conjunctions were exchanged, time has shown.

MINNESOTA IN 1858.

Mrs. Swisshelm's *St. Cloud Visitor* of the 3d inst. is before us, hailing from Stearns County, Minnesota, "Office on the River, opposite the steamboat landing;" but what river that is, and in what section of Minnesota St. Cloud is located, we can find no Gazetteer, no Atlas, sufficiently modern to inform us. A standing account in the papers of that city informs us, however, that

"St. Cloud is the point at which the Red River trains cross the Mississippi on their way to St. Paul, which proves it to be the natural junction of land travel between these two great arteries of trade. It is at the present head of steam navigation on the Mississippi. Boats run regularly during the Spring and early Summer months from St. Anthony to this place."

We further learn from this article that Gov. Stevens camped and left the Mississippi at this then nameless point when he surveyed the Northern route for a Pacific Railroad in 1853. The first cabin was built on this spot in 1855, and in 1857, 332 votes were polled here, and in the county 807. We guess St. Cloud is some fifty to eighty miles above the Falls of St. Anthony, and just below the heaviest Pine region of Minnesota, while a large tract of miscellaneous forest and "openings" here heavily belts the Mississippi. The soil is rich and deep, the natural meadows producing a very rank grass. The climate is cold, but healthful and invigorating. Wild grapes, plums and berries are abundant. The people of Stearns County were frightened by clouds of grasshoppers last season, which for a time threatened to devour every green thing; but they absconded in July, and do not seem to have left any progeny. And, though the crops of 1857 were much shortened by them, so that appeals were made to the charity of older and richer communities for aid to save the moneyless pioneers from famine, yet there seems to be bread enough in 1858: Wheat selling at St. Cloud at $1 25; Corn at $1, and Potatoes at 25 cents per bushel.

The leading article in *The Visitor* before us is a graphic account of a Buffalo Hunt which came off a few days previous on "the Red River of the North," a hundred miles or so west of St. Cloud, on the Decotah side of the river, and on the site of the embryo city of Breckenridge. It was an impromptu affair—the horses being propelled by clubs and rifle-barrels instead of spurs, and being disqualified by fear of the game for hunting it properly. Of the five buffaloes pursued, one only was killed—a bull whose meat weighed 900 pounds, and was pronounced capital fare. Buffalo are said to be plentiful in that region; elk and deer still more so; a herd of a hundred deer were seen last Winter 60 miles west of St. Cloud; several were killed within a few yards of *The Visitor* office, while bears were repeatedly seen but not taken. *The Visitor* says:

"We have promise of most abundant crops. Wheat and grass are very, very fine; the prairies are besprinkled with myriads of strawberry blossoms, and the woods and thickets with promises of other fruit. We have had no frost to injure the buds in the least."

The Retail Price Current gives the following among other prices:

Sugar—Maple 25c., Crushed 20c., Brown 15c. Molasses 80c. to $1. Pork, Mess, per bbl., $24; per lb. 14c. Salt per sack of 200 lb. $4 12. Rice per lb. 11c. Nails per lb. 7½@8c. Butter 15@17c. Cheese 15c. Codfish 10c. Dried Apples 15c.

Among the St. Cloud advertisers, in the number before us, are grocers, surveyors, carpenters, dry-goods men, hotel-keepers, boot and shoe sellers, dealers in real estate (too many of them), painters, a watchmaker, a druggist, a merchant tailor, &c., &c. These are located respectively in "East," "West" and "Lower St. Cloud," while St. Anthony and Minneapolis also put in their applications for custom.

On the whole, we judge that St. Cloud is a tolerably smart place for one not yet three years old, though there are doubtless scores in Minnesota no older yet quite as thriving, and some, perhaps, more so. We give the one of whose origin, growth and present condition we have some data, as a sample of a Western village just begun to grow.

RAILROAD MANNERS.

From The Cincinnati Gazette.

Will no benevolent gentleman write a code of manners for railroad cars? We stand much in need of one. We are not a barbarous people. On the contrary, we are a very well behaved, civil people, and stand high in the scale of civilization. We doubt whether the average civility and good breeding in English cars will equal that of our own. But, on the other hand, there are some barbarisms many among us think proper to indulge in, with an apparent unconsciousness that they are doing wrong. One of these is the monstrous use and abuse of tobacco. We are a tobacco-spitting nation. Even clergymen are not ashamed to spit tobacco. Judges, lawyers and legislators do it habitually. On the bench and in the pulpit, we see men, otherwise very respectable, squelching tobacco in their mouths, and spluttering, when they speak, as if they were half choked, and clearing their throats by eructating a great tobacco quid and making a puddle on the floor! A few days since we entered a beautiful Court-House in an interior town. The court-room was nicely finished and furnished. Everything was neatness itself, but one. From the door of the court-room to the streets, halls and staircases were puddled with tobacco juice!

But we are speaking of railroad matters, and we should recommend some attention to the following rules:

I. Do not puddle a car where there are ladies with tobacco juice; it dirties their dresses.

II. A young and healthy man should not occupy more than two seats. Twice as much room as an old gentleman or lady requires is enough for the cloak, band-box, carpet-bag and books of a merchant's clerk on a collecting tour.

III. Courting should be done at home. The world does not make sufficient allowance for amours in the cars. When people are seen to be uncommonly affectionate in the cars, the bystanders are apt to make remarks.

IV. Ladies who must wear hoops in traveling, should not make them more than two yards in diameter, as that is the greatest breadth with which they can be conveniently seated.

V. Men should not talk in the cars more than doubly as loud as they do in any other place, lest they should injure their voices.

VI. Children who are three or four years old, and in the habit of crying for everything they see without being punished, should be kept at home until their parents learn how to govern them.

VII. If the first and last of these rules cannot be observed, then the tobacco puddlers and the parents who never punish should be put in the same car together, to enjoy each other's company.

We merely throw out these as *hints* of some improvements which *may* happen in the time of the Millennium—to expect them in less time is perhaps visionary. In this free and happy Republic we take domestic affairs easy, and are only intent on increasing the very small area of our territory. Perhaps we are too severe in even hinting these improvements; but we learned from high authority, that *good manners belong to the minor morals;* and, as civility costs nothing, there is no excuse for neglecting it.

A SENTIMENTAL ROBBER—KISSES MORE PRECIOUS THAN JEWELS.—A night or two ago, a fair, sweet girl, residing on Race, rear of Fourth street, was partially awakened from her slumbers by a man in her chamber, but not fully aroused, she lay with closed lips for a minute, when, the sound being repeated, she started up and saw, by the light of the little jet upon the gas-burner, a man's form disappearing through the window. She screamed involuntarily, and her father, armed with a revolver, was in her room in a few moments, greatly agitated and alarmed, questioning his lovely daughter as to the cause of her fear. She told him what had frightened her, and he ran to the open window, looked out upon the balcony and into the yard, but could see nothing of the terrible man, the midnight robber, and disturber of the dove-eyed darling's rest. The parent was disposed to think his daughter had been dreaming, that her imagination had painted what was not real, but on returning to her apartment, she assured him she was wide awake, and that she had seen all she had stated. Her father was still incredulous, when, in looking around, he observed upon his daughter's dressing bureau, where a beautiful enameled watch, a pair of heavy bracelets, a diamond ring, and a necklace were lying, a slip of paper, on which was written:

FAIREST, DEAREST GIRL: I came here to rob, but your beauty has made me honest for the time. I saw these jewels, but believing them yours, I could not take them. I have stolen what I value more—three delicious kisses from your unconscious lips. Do not be offended; they were gentle and innocent.

AN UNKNOWN LOVER.

This story sounds romantic, we are aware, and perhaps some of our matter-of-fact readers will be skeptical in relation thereto, but we are assured upon the best authority that it is strictly veracious, and we publish it as an evidence that the age of gallantry and sentiment is not at an end; that the race of Rinaldo Rinaldini is not extinct. [N. O. Delta.